

1 STOEL RIVES LLP
2 David B. Levant
3 Erin L. Eliasen
4 600 University Street, Suite 3600
5 Seattle, Washington 98101
6 Telephone: (206) 624-0900
7 Facsimile: (206) 386-7500
8 dblevant@stoel.com
9 eleliasen@stoel.com

10 LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
11 Peter M. Gilhuly (*admitted pro hac vice*)
12 Ted A. Dillman (*admitted pro hac vice*)
13 355 South Grand Avenue
14 Los Angeles, California 90071-1560
15 Telephone: (213) 485-1234
16 Facsimile: (213) 891-8763
17 peter.gilhuly@lw.com
18 ted.dillman@lw.com

19 Attorneys for General Electric Capital
20 Corporation

21 IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

22 EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

23 In re

24 CENTURION PROPERTIES III,
25 LLC

26 Debtor and Debtor-in-Possession.

27 Chapter 11

28 Case No. 10-04024-FLK 11

**OBJECTION OF GENERAL
ELECTRIC CAPITAL CORPORATION
TO DEBTOR'S DISCLOSURE
STATEMENT DESCRIBING
DEBTOR'S CHAPTER 11 PLAN OF
REORGANIZATION**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. BACKGROUND	2
A. GECC's Loan And Debtor's Liability	2
1. Loan	2
2. Security Interest	2
3. Property.....	3
B. Cash Collateral Stipulations.....	4
C. Default/Event Of Default.....	4
1. The Debtor Failed To Repay GECC Outstanding Principal	4
III. ARGUMENT.....	5
A. The Disclosure Statement Must Provide Adequate Information But Fails To Do So	5
1. Legal Standard	5
2. The Disclosure Statement Fails To Provide Adequate Information.....	7
B. The Debtor Fails To Provide A Current Valuation Of Its Sole Asset.....	7
C. The Debtor Fails To Accurately Represent Claims Against The Estate, And Misleads The Court And Creditors Regarding The Possibility Of A Cram Down.....	8
1. The Debtor Fails To Disclose That GECC Holds The Only Undisputed Claim That Is Impaired And That It Cannot Cram Down GECC.	8
2. The Debtor Fails To Disclose That The Plan Seeks To Disallow Default Interest Even Though GECC Is Entitled To It.....	13
3. GECC's Lien Encumbers All Real And Personal Property.....	14
D. The Liquidation Analysis Is Not Supported By Any Facts And Does Not Meet The Requirements Of The Bankruptcy Code.....	15
E. The Debtor Fails To Provide Any Facts Supporting The Feasibility Of The Plan And The Plan Is Not Feasible	16
F. The Debtor Fails To Adequately Disclose The Risk Factors Relating To Its Ability To Refinance And/Or Sell	

1	The Property.....	19
2	1. The Debtor Does Not Adequately Disclose The Tenant Risk.....	19
3	2. The Debtor Does Not Adequately Disclose The Market Risk	20
4	3. The Debtor Is Likely To Face A Subsequent Liquidation.....	21
5	G. The Infeasibility Of The Plan And Anticipated Liquidation Make It Unconfirmable	21
6	H. Disapproval Of The Disclosure Statement Will Preserve The Estate.....	22
7	IV. CONCLUSION	23

1 TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

2 Page

3 CASES

<i>Aetna Realty Inv., Inc. v. Monarch Beach Venture, Ltd. (In re Monarch Beach Venture, Ltd.),</i> 166 B.R. 428 (C.D. Cal. 1993).....	8
<i>Class Five Nev. Claimants v. Dow Corning Corp. (In re Dow Corning Corp.),</i> 280 F.3d 648 (6th Cir), cert. denied, 537 U.S. 816, 123 S. Ct. 85, 154 L. Ed. 2d 21 (2002).....	9
<i>Farm Credit Bank of Spokane v. Tucker,</i> 62 Wn. App. 196, 813 P.2d 619 (1991)	14
<i>GE Capital Corp. v. Future Media Prods.,</i> 536 F.3d 969 (9th Cir. Cal. 2008)	14
<i>Hepner v. PWP Golden Eagle Tree, LLC (In re K& J Props.),</i> 338 B.R. 450 (Bankr. D. Colo. 2005).....	12
<i>In re Bjolmes Realty Trust,</i> 134 B.R. 1000 (Bankr. D. Mass. 1991).....	19
<i>In re Cardinal Congregate I,</i> 121 B.R. 760 (Bankr. S.D. Ohio 1990)	16, 19, 22
<i>In re Civitella,</i> 15 B.R. 206 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. 1981).....	6
<i>In re Consul Restaurant Corp.,</i> 146 B.R. 979 (Bankr. D. Minn. 1992).....	9
<i>In re Dakota Rail, Inc.,</i> 104 B.R. 138 (Bankr. D. Minn. 1989).....	5, 6, 7
<i>In re Diberto,</i> 164 B.R. 1 (Bankr. D. N.H. 1993).....	19
<i>In re Dow Corning Corp.,</i> 244 B.R. 705 (Bankr. E.D. Mich. 1999), aff'd in relevant part, 255 B.R. 445 (E.D. Mich. 2000)	9
<i>In re Eastern Maine Electric Cooperative, Inc.,</i> 125 B.R. 329 (Bankr. D. Me. 1991).....	21
<i>In re Egan,</i> 33 B.R. 672 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 1983).....	17

1	<i>In re Market Square Inn, Inc.,</i> 163 B.R. 64 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 1994).....	22
2	<i>In re Monroe Well Service, Inc.,</i> 80 B.R. 324 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. 1987).....	5, 6, 22
4	<i>In re Northwest Recreational Activities, Inc.,</i> 8 B.R. 10 (Bankr. N.D. Ga. 1980).....	6
6	<i>In re Oxford Homes, Inc.,</i> 204 B.R. 264 (Bankr. D. Me. 1997).....	6
7	<i>In re Pecht,</i> 53 B.R. 768 (Bankr. E.D. Va. 1985)	22
9	<i>In re Pecht,</i> 57 B.R. 137 (Bankr. E.D. Va. 1986)	22
11	<i>In re Scioto Valley Mortgage Co.,</i> 88 B.R. 168 (Bankr. S.D. Ohio 1988)	7
12	<i>In re The Prudential Energy Company,</i> 59 B.R. 765 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1986)	6, 16
14	<i>In re U.S. Brass Corp.,</i> 194 B.R. 420 (Bankr. E.D. Tex. 1996).....	5, 6
16	<i>Intercommunity-Mercy Wash. II Ltd. P'ship. v. Wallace,</i> 1996 Wash. App. LEXIS 372 (Wash. Ct. App. 1996)	14
17	<i>Krutz v. Robbins,</i> 12 Wash. 7, 40 P. 415 (1895)	14
19	<i>Sloane v. Lucas,</i> 37 Wash. 348, 79 P. 949 (1905)	14
21	STATUTES	
22	11 U.S.C. § 1124(2)(B)	12
23	11 U.S.C. § 1125.....	19
24	11 U.S.C. § 1125(a)	5
25	11 U.S.C. § 1125(b).....	5
26	11 U.S.C. § 1129.....	15
27	11 U.S.C. § 1129(a)	16, 21
28	11 U.S.C. § 1129(a)(11)	21

1	11 U.S.C. § 1129(a)(7)	15, 16
2	11 U.S.C. § 1129(b).....	8, 9
3	11 U.S.C. § 1129(b)(1)	8
4	11 U.S.C. § 1129(b)(2)(A).....	12
5	OTHER AUTHORITIES	
6	H.R. Rep. No. 595, 1st Sess. 414 (1977).....	12
7	RULES	
8	Local Bankruptcy Rule 3017-1.....	6, 7
9	TREATISES	
10	Collier on Bankruptcy P 1125.02[2] (Alan N. Resnick & Henry J.	
11	Sommer eds., 16th ed.)	7
12	Collier on Bankruptcy P 1129.03 (Alan N. Resnick & Henry J. Sommer	
13	eds., 16th ed.).....	9
14	Glen W. Merrick, The Chapter 11 Disclosure Statement in a Strategic	
15	Environment, 44 The Business Lawyer 103 (November 1988).....	7

1 General Electric Capital Corporation (“GECC”) hereby objects
2 (this “**Objection**”) to the approval of the Disclosure Statement Describing
3 Debtor’s Chapter 11 Plan of Reorganization, entered on January 20, 2011 [Docket
4 No. 160] (the “**Disclosure Statement**”) filed by the above captioned debtor and
5 debtor-in-possession (the “**Debtor**”) and the Debtor’s accompanying Chapter 11
6 Plan of Reorganization [Docket No. 161] (the “**Plan**”).

7 **I. INTRODUCTION**

8 The Debtor fails to disclose that it does not propose a plan of reorganization.
9 Rather, it is a “plan” to have a plan in three years. Moreover, the Debtor fails to
10 disclose that, in all probability, it will *not* be able to effectuate the refinancing that
11 is the cornerstone of the Plan.

12 In effect, the Debtor seeks a three-year extension of GECC’s fully matured
13 Loan to enable the Debtor to litigate disputed claims and to seek financing to repay
14 GECC. During this three-year period, the Debtor proposes to pay GECC the non-
15 default contract rate of interest of 6.36%, even though the Loan is fully matured,
16 was in default pre-petition, and GECC is contractually and legally entitled to
17 payment of interest at the 11.36% default rate. Moreover, the Disclosure
18 Statement fails to provide facts that support the feasibility of the Plan (which is not
19 in fact feasible), and fails to disclose that the Plan impermissibly shifts risks to
20 GECC and will most likely be followed by a liquidation.

21 The Plan improperly seeks to shift all of the risk onto GECC, the first
22 priority secured creditor, while the Debtor prays for the recovery of the real estate
23 and credit markets, all the while proposing to pay unsecured creditors ahead of
24 GECC and making believe that it can cram down GECC at a reinstatement rate of
25 interest. It fails to provide a current valuation of the Debtor’s sole asset (which
26 GECC believes the Debtor has grossly overstated), and fails to support the
27 feasibility of its Plan or its liquidation analysis with any evidence whatsoever. It
28 purports to seek to “cram down” the Plan if at least one class of non-insider

1 impaired claims votes to approve the Plan, but fails to disclose that GECC holds
2 the only non-insider, impaired claim, and therefore holds the only claim entitled to
3 vote under the terms of the Plan. GECC will not accept the proposed treatment of
4 its Claim, and the Debtor fails to disclose that this renders the Plan infeasible and
5 therefore unconfirmable.

6 This Plan is fatally defective and flawed. Allowing it to move forward
7 would waste both the Court’s and the Debtor’s time and resources. GECC has
8 afforded the Debtor every opportunity and consistently worked with the Debtor to
9 make progress in this case (including terminating its control over the Debtor’s cash
10 and consenting to the use of cash collateral to hire an expert to assist the Debtor in
11 obtaining financing). However, this is a single asset real estate case and GECC
12 should not be held hostage forever. Unless the Debtor can propose a credible,
13 confirmable plan of reorganization that can be consummated within a reasonable
14 period of time (e.g., six months, not three years), the case should either be
15 converted to a chapter 7 or GECC should be granted relief from stay, thereby
16 allowing all parties in interest to recover their collateral and protect their interests
17 under applicable state law.

II. BACKGROUND

A. GECC's Loan And Debtor's Liability.

1. **Loan.**

21 On or about November 28, 2006, GECC and the Debtor entered into a Loan
22 Agreement (the “**Loan Agreement**,” and the loan made pursuant thereto, the
23 “**Loan**”) in the original principal amount of \$70,866,000. (Loan Agreement,
24 § 2.1). A true and correct copy of the Loan Agreement is attached as Exhibit A to
25 the Declaration of Sebastian Perin (“**Perin Decl.**”) filed in support hereof. The
26 Loan matured by its terms on November 30, 2009. (Loan Agreement, § 1.01).

2. Security Interest.

28 It is undisputed that GECC “holds a valid, perfected, enforceable, and

1 unavoidable first priority lien upon and security interest in substantially all of the
2 Debtor's assets, including real and personal property and cash collateral, which
3 secure Debtor's prepetition obligations to GECC." (See Memorandum in Support
4 of Debtor's Motion for Order Extending Exclusivity [Docket No. 87] (the
5 "**Exclusivity Motion**"), p. 6; Amended Cash Collateral Order, p. 11). The
6 prepetition outstanding principal balance of GECC's lien was not less than
7 \$58,258,354.28, plus other amounts owing under the loan documents, including
8 interest, fees, and expenses. On November 23, 2010, GECC timely filed its Proof
9 of Claim in the above-captioned proceedings in the amount of \$59,190,636.94 plus
10 other amounts set forth therein (the "**Claim**").

11 **3. Property.**

12 The "**Battelle Property**" is a campus style property located in Richland
13 Washington. The Debtor's key asset consists of its leasehold interest in the
14 Battelle Property (the "**Battelle Leaseholds**"). Specifically, the Debtor leases the
15 underlying land from Battelle Memorial Institute ("**Battelle**"), under certain
16 ground leases, expiring between 2051 and 2060 (the "**Ground Leases**"). The
17 Debtor owns the five buildings, related improvements and common areas located
18 on the Battelle Property, and leases these facilities back to Battelle under shorter
19 term Facilities Leases, expiring between 2017 and 2018 (the "**Facilities Leases**").
20 Pursuant to the terms of the Facilities Leases, Battelle pays the Debtor significantly
21 more than the Debtor pays to Battelle pursuant to the terms of the Ground Leases.
22 The Battelle Leases constitute substantially all of the Debtor's assets. The
23 Debtor's interest in the Ground Leases, the Facilities Leases, and the facilities
24 themselves secure repayment of the Loan. Managing and operating the Battelle
25 Property represents substantially all of the Debtor's business and generates
26 substantially all of the Debtor's gross income. (Perin Decl. ¶ 11).

27 The Debtor has represented that the value of its interest in the Battelle
28 Property is approximately \$98 million. (Disclosure Statement, VI.J, p. 39). This

1 valuation is based on an appraisal from June 8, 2008, which substantially pre-dates
2 the “meltdown” of the real estate markets. GECC is in the process of obtaining a
3 current appraisal, but believes that the value represented by the Debtor is likely
4 significantly overstated.

5 **B. Cash Collateral Stipulations.**

6 Substantially at the outset of the case, GECC and the Debtor stipulated to the
7 use of GECC’s cash collateral, which was approved by the Court pursuant to that
8 certain Stipulated Order Authorizing Final Use of Cash Collateral [Docket No. 76],
9 entered on September 17, 2010 (the “**First Cash Collateral Order**”). On
10 December 30, 2010, the Court entered that certain Stipulated Amended and
11 Restated Order Authorizing Final Use of Cash Collateral [Docket No. 147]
12 (the “**Amended Cash Collateral Order**” and together with the First Cash
13 Collateral Order, the “**Cash Collateral Orders**”).

14 Prior to the Cash Collateral Orders, all revenues from the Battelle Property
15 were deposited into a lockbox, which was controlled by GECC. Through the Cash
16 Collateral Orders, GECC consensually agreed to terminate the lockbox and allow
17 all of the revenue to be paid into a Money Market Account (the “**Money Market**
18 **Account**”) controlled by the Debtor, subject to the Cash Collateral Orders. GECC
19 was granted a first priority perfected security interest in and lien upon the Money
20 Market Account, all of the Debtor’s rights in the funds therein, and any interest
21 earned thereon. (Amended Cash Collateral Order, pp. 7-8).

22 **C. Default/Event Of Default.**

23 **1. The Debtor Failed To Repay GECC Outstanding Principal.**

24 The Loan matured on November 30, 2009 (the “**Maturity Date**”) and the
25 Debtor failed to repay the amounts due. This constituted an Event of Default under
26 the Loan Agreement, during the existence of which the Loan bears interest at the
27 “**Default Rate**” of an additional 5% over the 6.36% rate that applies when no
28 Event of Default exists. (Loan Agreement, § 2.2). The Event of Default has not

been cured by the Debtor as of the date hereof. (Perin Decl. ¶ 16).

Also, pursuant to the Cash Collateral Orders, GECC and the Debtor agreed, and the Court ordered, that the Debtor would pay GECC \$330,000 per month (representing payment of interest at 6.36%) and would accrue default interest at an additional 5%. (Cash Collateral Order, p. 9). Although the Debtor reserved the right to modify the terms of the Loan, including the Default Rate, through a plan of reorganization, the Debtor has no such right and fails to assert any basis which would allow the Debtor to modify GECC's clear legal entitlement to default interest and costs. (*Id.*).

III. ARGUMENT

A. The Disclosure Statement Must Provide Adequate Information But Fails To Do So.

1. Legal Standard.

The disclosure statement must provide creditors with adequate information that enables them to determine whether to accept or reject a proposed plan of reorganization. The purpose of the disclosure statement is not to assure the acceptance or rejection of a plan, but rather to provide *facts* upon which interested parties can make an informed decision. See *In Re Dakota Rail, Inc.*, 104 B.R. 138, 142 (Bankr. D. Minn. 1989); *In Re Monroe Well Service, Inc.*, 80 B.R. 324, 330 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. 1987); *In re U.S. Brass Corp.*, 194 B.R. 420, 423 (Bankr. E.D. Tex. 1996).

Section 1125(b) of Title 11, United States Code (the “**Bankruptcy Code**”) precludes this Court from approving the Disclosure Statement unless it contains “adequate information.” “Adequate information” is defined as:

information of a kind, and in sufficient detail...that would enable a hypothetical investor [typical of holders of claims or interests] of the relevant class to make an informed judgment about the plan.

11 U.S.C. § 1125(a).

1 “[T]he concept of adequate information under §1125 of the Code does not
2 contemplate revelation by inference. Creditors are not required or expected to rely
3 on inferences. Disclosure of material facts is what is required.” *See, e.g., In re*
4 *The Prudential Energy Company*, 59 B.R. 765, 768 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1986). Thus,
5 “adequate information” plainly requires that a disclosure statement include all *facts*
6 that might be material to a creditor’s evaluation of the proposed plan of
7 reorganization. The disclosure is inadequate if it is based on inferences or the
8 debtor’s conclusions. (*Id.*)

9 For a disclosure statement to provide adequate information, it must also
10 contain sufficient financial information, so that a creditor (a hypothetical investor)
11 can make an informed judgment as to whether to accept or reject the proposed plan
12 of reorganization. *See In Re Monroe Well Service, Inc.*, 80 B.R. at 330; *In Re*
13 *Civitella*, 15 B.R. 206 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. 1981); *In Re Northwest Recreational*
14 *Activities, Inc.*, 8 B.R. 10 (Bankr. N.D. Ga. 1980).

15 Courts generally require and Local Bankruptcy Rule 3017-1 mandates that
16 every disclosure statement provide *at least*:

- 17 (a) a complete description of the available assets and their values;
- 18 (b) information regarding claims against the estate;
- 19 (c) a liquidation analysis setting forth the estimated return that creditors
20 would receive under Chapter 7;
- 21 (d) any financial information, valuations or *pro forma* projections that
22 would be relevant to creditors’ determinations of whether to accept or
23 reject the plan;
- 24 (e) information relevant to the risks being taken by the creditors and
25 interest holders; and
- 26 (f) a statement as to how the plan is to be executed.

27 *See In Re Dakota Rail, Inc.*, 104 B.R. at 142-143; *In Re Oxford Homes, Inc.*, 204
28 B.R. 264, 269 (Bankr. D. Me. 1997); *In Re U.S. Brass Corp.*, 194 B.R. at 424-425;

In re Scioto Valley Mortgage Co., 88 B.R. 168 (Bankr. S.D. Ohio 1988); see also Collier on Bankruptcy P 1125.02[2] (Alan N. Resnick & Henry J. Sommer eds., 16th ed.); Glen W. Merrick, The Chapter 11 Disclosure Statement in a Strategic Environment, 44 The Business Lawyer 103, 113-116 (November 1988).

2. The Disclosure Statement Fails To Provide Adequate Information.

The Debtor’s Disclosure Statement fails to provide adequate information and does not meet the requirements of Local Bankruptcy Rule 3017-1 because: (i) it does not provide the current valuation of the Debtor’s sole asset, (ii) it fails to accurately represent the claims against the estate, (iii) it fails to disclose that a cram down is improper and infeasible, (iv) the Debtor’s liquidation analysis is not supported by facts, does not disclose the expected recoveries of each class of creditors in a chapter 7 liquidation, and does not meet the other requirements of the Bankruptcy Code, and (v) it provides *no* facts supporting the Plan’s feasibility, among other things. As a result, the Disclosure Statement does not provide adequate information to allow GECC and other creditors to make an informed judgment as to whether the Debtor can effectuate the Plan (which it probably cannot), and whether the creditors should accept the Plan (which GECC will not). Accordingly, the Disclosure Statement may not be approved.

B. The Debtor Fails To Provide A Current Valuation Of Its Sole Asset.

22 The Debtor must provide a complete description of the available assets and
23 their values, and otherwise provide current financial information. *See e.g.* Local
24 Bankruptcy Rule 3017-1; *In Re Dakota Rail, Inc.*, 104 B.R. at 142-143. The
25 Debtor only has one asset – the Battelle Leaseholds and the improvements located
26 thereon. The Debtor claims that this asset has been “valued in excess of \$90
27 million,” and that the estimated fair market value of the Debtor’s interest in
28 Battelle Property is \$98 million, based on an appraisal dated June 9, 2008. (*See*

1 Disclosure Statement, V.B, p. 25 and VI.J, 39).

2 The Debtor fails to disclose that real estate and credit markets have changed
3 dramatically since June 2008, that real estate prices are generally far lower today
4 than in 2008, and that, despite the Debtor's claim that "every effort has been made
5 to provide the most accurate information available," the Debtor has not even
6 attempted to obtain an updated appraisal for its only asset. (Disclosure Statement,
7 III.C, p. 9). GECC is in the process of obtaining an appraisal of the Battelle
8 Leaseholds, but believes that the asset's value has likely declined dramatically
9 since 2008. (*See* Perin Decl. ¶ 10).

10 The Debtor must disclose facts to support its Plan, its assets and their values
11 and provide current financial information. The Debtor's inability to put forth any
12 evidence regarding the current value of its single asset renders the "disclosure"
13 contained in the Disclosure Statement illusory. This results in the lack of adequate
14 information and, therefore, the Disclosure Statement may not be approved.

15 **C. The Debtor Fails To Accurately Represent Claims Against The**
16 **Estate, And Misleads The Court And Creditors Regarding The**
17 **Possibility Of A Cram Down.**

18 **1. The Debtor Fails To Disclose That GECC Holds The Only**
19 **Undisputed Claim That Is Impaired And That It Cannot**
20 **Cram Down GECC.**

21 **(a) A Cram Down Would Not Be Fair And Equitable.**

22 A cram down is only permissible if it is fair and equitable, and does not
23 discriminate unfairly. 11 U.S.C. § 1129(b)(1). "When the proposed distribution
24 would substantially shift the risk of failure of the plan from a junior class to a
25 senior dissenting class for no legitimate purpose, the plan is not fair and equitable
26 to the dissenting class," thus rendering cram down under Section 1129(b) of the
27 Bankruptcy Code improper. *Aetna Realty Inv., Inc. v. Monarch Beach Venture,*
28 *Ltd. (In re Monarch Beach Venture, Ltd.)*, 166 B.R. 428, 436 (C.D. Cal. 1993)

1 (quoting *In re Consul Restaurant Corp.*, 146 B.R. 979, 989 (Bankr. D. Minn.
2 1992)); *see also In re Dow Corning Corp.*, 244 B.R. 705, 710-11 (Bankr. E.D.
3 Mich. 1999), aff'd in relevant part, 255 B.R. 445 (E.D. Mich. 2000), aff'd in part
4 and remanded, *Class Five Nev. Claimants v. Dow Corning Corp. (In re Dow*
5 *Corning Corp.)*, 280 F.3d 648 (6th Cir), cert. denied, 537 U.S. 816, 123 S. Ct. 85,
6 154 L. Ed. 2d 21 (2002). Section 1129(b)'s requirements are "are both numerous
7 and exacting," and place the burden of proof "squarely" on the proponent of the
8 plan. *See Collier on Bankruptcy P 1129.03* (Alan N. Resnick & Henry J. Sommer
9 eds., 16th ed.). This requirement is not satisfied by the Plan.

10 GECC is the only creditor with a significant, undisputed claim that is
11 impaired under the Plan. For instance, while the secured claim of the Benton
12 County Treasurer and general unsecured claims (held both by insiders and third
13 parties) are classified as "impaired," the Plan provides that they are to be paid in
14 full, with interest, within 60 or 90 days of the Effective Date. Moreover, the
15 Debtor asserts that the County Treasurer's claim has been paid, and the Cash
16 Collateral Orders have provided for current payment of taxes related to the Battelle
17 Property. (Perin Decl. ¶ 15; Disclosure Statement VI.B.2.b, p. 30). Further, these
18 creditors are owed *de minimis* amounts compared to GECC's Claim, and the
19 Debtor has sufficient liquidity to pay them on the Effective Date in full, rendering
20 them unimpaired. In contrast, under the Plan, GECC's undisputed, first priority,
21 secured claim will not be repaid until 3 years after the Effective Date (or, more
22 likely, not at all).

23 The proposed cram down of GECC has the effect of shifting all risk to the
24 senior, secured creditor, while providing practically immediate payment in full to
25 other creditors, including unsecured creditors and insiders, from GECC's
26 collateral. Such a result is patently inappropriate and constitutes unfair
27 discrimination against GECC.

28 ///

(b) A Cram Down Is Not Feasible Because GECC Is The Only Impaired Creditor Entitled To Vote.

The Disclosure Statement provides that the Debtor will seek to confirm the Plan under the cram down provisions of 1129(b), “assuming that at least one Impaired Class votes to accept the Plan.” (Disclosure Statement, III.B.4, p. 7). However, the Debtor fails to disclose that GECC’s Claim represents the only truly impaired, non-insider class that will be entitled to vote, that GECC will not accept the treatment proposed for its Claim, and that a cram down is therefore not possible.

Under Section 1129(a)(10) of the Bankruptcy Code, the votes of insider claims and unimpaired claims are not entitled to vote, and are irrelevant in determining whether the Plan can be crammed down. Moreover, the Disclosure Statement provides that the holders of disputed claims are not entitled to vote on the Plan. (*See* Disclosure Statement, III.B.1, pp. 4-5). Therefore, in order for the Plan to be crammed down, at least one class of undisputed, impaired, non-insider claims must vote to accept it.

A review of the classes of claims set forth on Exhibit B of the Disclosure Statement reveals that GECC is the only creditor whose claim is impaired in any real sense, undisputed, and not held by an insider. Thus, the vote of GECC's Claim is the only vote relevant for cram down. The other claims are held by insiders, disputed, or are not in fact impaired in any meaningful way.

The claims of Centurion Pacific, LLC and Centurion Southwest LLC (Class 9) and Sigma Management, Inc. (Class 11) are insider claims, and therefore their votes are excluded when determining whether an impaired class has accepted the Plan. (*See* Disclosure Statement, VI.B.2.f and h, pp. 32-33; Plan, II.B.2.f and h, pp. 13-14). The claims of Centrum Financial Services, Inc. (Class 7) and Equity Funding, LLC (Class 8) are disputed and will not be allowed to vote. (*See* Disclosure Statement, III.B.1, pp. 4-5).

1 Lastly, the claims of the Benton County Treasurer (Class 5) and the general,
2 non-insider unsecured claims (Class 10) (which represent the only non-insider,
3 undisputed claims) are not in fact impaired in any real sense. Regarding the
4 former, payment is authorized under the Cash Collateral Order and the Debtor has
5 represented that it believes that the claim has been paid. (*See* Disclosure
6 Statement, VI.B.2.b, p. 30). To the extent not paid, the Plan provides for payment
7 of the claim in full, with interest, within 60 days of the Effective Date. Such
8 payment could be funded entirely as of the Effective Date in light of the Debtor's
9 approximately \$2.96 million accumulated cash balance. (Perin Decl. ¶ 14).
10 Moreover, there are only \$3,313 of unsecured claims held by non-insiders, which,
11 under the Plan, will be paid in full, with interest, within 90 days of the Effective
12 Date. Again, there is no reason that these *de minimis* claims cannot be paid as of
13 the Effective Date, considering the Debtor's considerable accumulated cash
14 balance, and, even if they are not, these claims are effectively unimpaired. (*Id.*)
15 The same is the case for insider unsecured claims.

16 The Debtor therefore fails to accurately characterize and adequately disclose
17 the classes of claims entitled to vote on the Plan. Once disclosed, the cram down
18 provisions of the Plan are unworkable, and the Plan is therefore infeasible. GECC
19 holds the only undisputed claim that is impaired in any true sense, and is therefore
20 the only creditor entitled to vote on the Plan under its terms. The other creditors in
21 this case are insiders, hold disputed claims, have already been paid, or are not
22 impaired in any meaningful sense (and therefore cannot vote). GECC will not
23 accept the Plan's proposed treatment of its Claim and, therefore, the Debtor cannot
24 cram down GECC because no impaired class entitled to vote is likely to accept the
25 Plan. The Debtor's failure to disclose this obvious risk to the Plan's confirmability
26 renders the Disclosure Statement inadequate.

27 ///

28 ///

(c) The Debtor Has Not Disclosed Facts That Would Support Its Ability To Cram Down GECC, Which Is Not Feasible.

Under Section 1129(b)(2)(A) of the Bankruptcy Code, in order to impose a cram down, GECC must receive “deferred cash payments totaling at least the allowed amount of such claim, of a value, as of the effective date of the plan, of at least the value of such holder’s interest in the estate’s interest in such property.” Congress was clear that the requirement that a creditor or interest holder receive property “of a value, as of the effective date of the plan” meant that Courts were to calculate the “present value” of the property. *See* H.R. Rep. No. 595, 1st Sess. 414 (1977) (“This contemplates a present value analysis that will discount value to be received in the future”).

In its Disclosure Statement, the Debtor states that GECC's Claim "shall accrue interest at the rate of six and thirty-sixths (6.36%) per annum on account of its Allowed Claim...and at the end of 36 months GECC shall be paid in full any unpaid amount, if any, of its Allowed Claim." (Disclosure Statement, VI.B.2.a, p. 29; Plan, II.B.2.a, p. 11). In seeking to pay GECC an interest rate of only 6.36%, it appears that the Debtor is attempting to reinstate GECC's fully matured Loan. This is prohibited. Under Section 1124(2)(B) of the Bankruptcy Code, the Debtor may only reinstate a loan if (a) it has not matured, and (b) all defaults are cured. In this case, the Loan matured on November 30, 2009. Therefore, the Debtor cannot reinstate the Loan. *See Hepner v. PWP Golden Eagle Tree, LLC (In re K & J Props.)*, 338 B.R. 450, 461 (Bankr. D. Colo. 2005) ("[N]o reorganization plan of these Debtors could cure these loans and reinstate the original maturity, as the maturity date of these loans predated the filing of these Debtors' bankruptcies").

27 The Debtor fails to disclose that the proposed rate of 6.36% rate is a grossly
28 inadequate cram down interest rate, and could only be achieved if reinstatement

1 were possible (which it is not here). The Debtor has also failed to provide any data
2 that would support the use of the 6.36% interest rate in a cram down scenario. In
3 fact, an appropriate cram down rate would be *dramatically* higher, likely between
4 13% and 15%. (*See* Declaration of David Rifkind (“**Rifkind Decl.**”), ¶ 8).

5 Moreover, after paying the higher interest rate, the Debtor’s cash flow will
6 be insufficient to fund the Plan. For instance, making interest only payments on
7 GECC’s Claim at these rates would require monthly payments to GECC of
8 between approximately \$641,000 and \$740,000. The Debtor’s monthly cash flow
9 is approximately \$556,000. (*See* Disclosure Statement, IV.C, p. 14). After making
10 payments at either rate, the Debtor would be insolvent on a cash flow basis as of
11 the Effective Date.

12 In addition, because the Debtor has failed to disclose any facts that show it
13 could cram down GECC at an interest rate of 6.36% or that it will be able to fund
14 its Plan after an appropriate interest rate is paid. Accordingly, the Disclosure
15 Statement does not provide adequate information, and may not be approved.

16 **2. The Debtor Fails To Disclose That The Plan Seeks To**
17 **Disallow Default Interest Even Though GECC Is Entitled**
18 **To It.**

19 Article XII of the Plan provides that the Debtor will not make any
20 distributions “on account of any late charges, default interest and other charges
21 arising from any default or breach by the Debtor.” (Plan, XII, p. 25). However,
22 there is no mention of this in the Disclosure Statement.

23 GECC timely filed a proof of claim asserting its right to default interest
24 which accumulates at approximately \$2.9 million per year. The Debtor stipulated
25 that default interest would accrue on the Loan in the Cash Collateral Orders. (*See*
26 Amended Cash Collateral Order, p. 9). Although the Debtor reserved any right it
27 may have had to modify the Loan, including the default interest provisions,
28 through a plan of reorganization, the Debtor failed to disclose that it has no such

1 right and that GECC is entitled to default interest and other charges under Ninth
2 Circuit law.

3 The Ninth Circuit has stated that the rule is “to apply a presumption of
4 allowability for the contracted default rate, provided that the rate is not
5 unenforceable under applicable nonbankruptcy law.” *GE Capital Corp. v. Future*
6 *Media Prods.*, 536 F.3d 969, 974 (9th Cir. 2008) (internal quotations omitted).
7 Under Washington law, Courts will apply a default rate of interest so long as it is
8 not usurious and does not constitute a penalty. *See Sloane v. Lucas*, 37 Wash. 348,
9 79 P. 949 (1905); *Farm Credit Bank of Spokane v. Tucker*, 62 Wn. App. 196, 813
10 P.2d 619 (1991). The cases in which a Washington Court held the default rate to
11 constitute a penalty involved provisions that retroactively applied a higher interest
12 rate (effectively treating the loan as in default from the time it was made). *See,*
13 *e.g., Krutz v. Robbins*, 12 Wash. 7, 40 P. 415 (1895); *Intercommunity-Mercy Wash.*
14 *II Ltd. P'ship. v. Wallace*, 1996 Wash. App. LEXIS 372 (Wash. Ct. App. 1996).
15 Here, the Default Rate provisions do not have retroactive application and, as such,
16 are effective. (*See* Loan Agreement, § 2.2).

17 In spite of this, the Debtor fails to disclose, in either the Plan or Disclosure
18 Statement, that GECC is contractually and legally entitled to all such charges, and
19 that the Debtor has no legal basis to escape these claims. Article XII of the Plan
20 also states that a creditor must file a motion for the allowance of such claims,
21 which is inconsistent with the claims process. (Plan, XII, p. 25). Although the
22 Debtor reserved any right it may have had to modify the Loan, this does not
23 authorize the Debtor to require GECC to prove its entitlement to these amounts
24 when the Debtor has not raised any argument as to why they should not be
25 allowed, particularly if, as the Debtor contends, GECC is oversecured.

26 **3. GECC’s Lien Encumbers All Real And Personal Property.**

27 In addition to failing to provide a current market value for its real estate
28 assets, the Debtor fails to disclose that all of its interest in real estate assets is

1 encumbered by GECC's lien. Although Section V.B.2 of the Disclosure Statement
2 explicitly states that all of the Debtor's personal property is encumbered by
3 GECC's lien, it fails to disclose that all real estate assets are similarly encumbered.
4 Moreover, the Debtor apparently continues to reserve the right to dispute claims,
5 and requires secured creditors to seek a determination of secured status
6 (presumably including GECC), even though GECC believes its lien to be
7 undisputed and the Debtor waived its right to dispute this lien under the terms of
8 the Amended Cash Collateral Order. (*Cf.* Amended Cash Collateral Order pp. 2-3,
9 11; Plan, IX, p. 22).

10 **D. The Liquidation Analysis Is Not Supported By Any Facts And**
11 **Does Not Meet The Requirements Of The Bankruptcy Code.**

12 Section 1129(a)(7) of the Bankruptcy Code requires a liquidation analysis
13 showing that every holder of a claim, in each class, will receive or retain under the
14 plan at least as much as such creditor would receive in a chapter 7 liquidation. The
15 liquidation analysis must be based upon *facts* and provide an analysis of *each* class
16 of impaired claims.

17 In the Disclosure Statement, the Debtor estimates the "fair market value" of
18 the Battelle Leaseholds to be approximately \$98 million and asserts that the
19 liquidation value would "presumably" be less than \$98 million. (Disclosure
20 Statement, VI.J, p. 39). However, as noted above, the Debtor does not provide any
21 credible support for its \$98 million valuation, nor does it provide any evidence or
22 analysis of the liquidation value of its assets. Despite the absence of any support,
23 the Debtor then concludes that its liquidation analysis satisfies the requirements of
24 Section 1129, which is utterly inaccurate.

25 As stated above, the Bankruptcy Code definition of "adequate information,"
26 requires that a disclosure statement include *facts* that may be material to a
27 creditor's evaluation of the proposed plan, as opposed to mere inferences or the
28 debtor's conclusions. *See, e.g., In re The Prudential Energy Company*, 59 B.R.

1 765, 768 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1986) (“Creditors are not required or expected to rely
2 on inferences. Disclosure of material facts is what is required”). The Debtor
3 provides no facts that would support the assertions made in its liquidation analysis
4 and, therefore, the Disclosure Statement fails to provide adequate information.

5 Moreover, Section 1129(a)(7) requires that *each* class of claims receive at
6 least as much as it would in a chapter 7 liquidation. The Debtor’s liquidation
7 analysis lumps all classes of claims together. Under the Plan, unsecured creditors
8 and other lienholders will be paid in full, with interest, within 60 to 90 days of the
9 Effective Date (and could easily be paid on the Effective Date). In contrast, GECC
10 will not be repaid until three years after these other creditors, including unsecured
11 creditors, are fully paid (from GECC’s collateral). The Debtor has failed to show
12 that GECC will receive as much under the Plan as if the Debtor’s interest in the
13 Battelle Property was liquidated and creditors were paid immediately in order of
14 priority (in which case, GECC would essentially be first in line). Thus, the Debtor
15 has not satisfied the requirements of Section 1129(a)(7), and the Disclosure
16 Statement cannot be approved.

17 **E. The Debtor Fails To Provide Any Facts Supporting The**
18 **Feasibility Of The Plan And The Plan Is Not Feasible.**

19 A plan of reorganization cannot be confirmed unless it is feasible. 11 U.S.C.
20 § 1129(a). The disclosure statement must include a *bona fide* explanation
21 regarding the plan’s execution, so that creditors can appreciate “all material
22 information relating to the risks posed to creditors... under the proposed plan.” *In*
23 *re Cardinal Congregate I*, 121 B.R. 760, 765 (Bankr. S.D. Ohio 1990). In this
24 case, the Debtor fails to set forth adequate information regarding the Plan’s
25 feasibility.

26 A central component of the Debtor’s “plan” involves refinancing the
27 Allowed Secured Claims (which principally, if not exclusively, consist of GECC’s
28 Claim), when (*if*) it is able to obtain “conventional” financing or “bond” financing.

1 (See Disclosure Statement, VI.F.1, p. 35; Plan, II.A, p. 9 and VI.A, p. 20). After
2 refinancing, the Debtor claims that it will pay all Allowed Claims in full within
3 thirty-six (36) months. (See Disclosure Statement, VI.A, p. 28; Plan, II.B.2.a, p.
4 11).

5 Based on the Debtor's testimony at the Section 341 meeting, GECC believes
6 that the Debtor has been attempting to secure financing since at least August 2010.
7 In order to grant the Debtor every opportunity to obtain financing, GECC agreed to
8 the use of its cash collateral to pay a "specialist" employed by the Debtor to assist
9 its "quest" for financing, and this "specialist" commenced his work in early
10 January if not before. However, despite these efforts, no concrete progress or clear
11 plan of refinancing is discussed in the Disclosure Statement. Although the Debtor
12 references the "financial information" provided in the Disclosure Statement, it does
13 not provide any evidence, aside from its own "belief," that it will be able to
14 refinance the Allowed Secured Claims. (Disclosure Statement, VI.H, p. 37).

15 Such statements regarding the Debtor's "belief" do not provide creditors any
16 meaningful factual information. This "disclosure" is therefore illusory. As one
17 Court stated:

18 statements of opinion or belief without factual support do
19 not belong in a disclosure statement....The purpose of
20 disclosure is to present the parties voting on the plan with
sufficient factual information to independently evaluate
the merits of the proponent's plan. It is clear that one
21 cannot arrive at an informed decision based on a
proponent's self-serving opinion.

22 *In re Egan*, 33 B.R. 672, 675 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 1983).

23 In addition, the Debtor does not provide facts regarding its ability to
24 refinance, and fails to describe the likelihood that it will not be able to refinance at
25 a rate that the cash flow from the Battelle Leaseholds will sustain.

26 In order to obtain sufficient financing to repay GECC's Claim, in light of the
27 risks associated with the Battelle Leaseholds, the Facilities Leases would need to
28 generate dramatically greater revenue and/or have significantly longer terms. (See

1 generally Rifkind Decl.). The risks related to the Battelle Leaseholds include
2 Battelle's right to terminate the Facilities Leases between 2017 and 2018 and the
3 fact that Battelle is paying above-market rent. This risk is compounded by the
4 difficulty the Debtor would have re-tenanting the Battelle Property. Further, a
5 potentially unappealing loan-to-value ratio, the lack of a tenant with an investment
6 grade credit rating, and the unavailability of a personal guaranty backed by
7 significant financial resources will also contribute to a high interest rate, decrease
8 the amount of debt proceeds the Debtor may be able to obtain, and/or limit the
9 Debtor's ability to obtain financing at all.¹ (See Rifkind Decl., ¶ 23). Moreover,
10 the market for lending based on *leasehold* interests is different than the fee simple
11 lending market, and may render financing unobtainable in light of these project
12 specific risks. (See *Id.* at ¶ 24).

13 The Disclosure Statement claims that the Debtor intends to pursue "bond
14 financing." (Disclosure Statement VI.F.1, p. 35). However, the "market for bond
15 financing for non-investment grade, short duration leases does not exist at the
16 present time." (Rifkind Decl. ¶ 24). Moreover, in terms of either "bond financing"
17 or "conventional financing," while significant sources of capital are available to
18 provide real estate financing, current "underwriting requirements are strict and
19 conservative." (*Id.* at ¶ 13). Because Battelle is not an investment grade entity and
20 due to the short duration of the Facilities Leases, a new lender will require a
21 guaranty of any new debt from an individual with significant financial resources.
22 (*Id.* at ¶ 23). Generally, the "rule of thumb" for a satisfactory guaranty requires the
23 guarantor have "a net worth, outside of the subject asset, equal to or in excess of

24 _____
25 ¹ Although the Debtor estimates the fair market value of the Battelle Property
26 to be approximately \$98 million, this June 2008 appraisal likely significantly
27 overstates the value of the Battelle Property. (See Disclosure Statement,
28 VI.J, p. 39).

1 the loan amount being requested and liquid cash reserves equal to or greater than
2 20% of the loan amount.” (*Id.* at ¶ 23). Moreover, assuming an acceptable
3 guaranty could be found, a new lender would require any new loan be fully
4 amortized (i.e. repaid) prior to the end of the Facilities Leases, and while making
5 interest and principal payments, conventional financing would only be obtainable
6 based on a loan-to-value ratio not to exceed 60% and a debt service coverage ratio
7 of at least 1.35:1. (*Id.* at ¶ 26). As set forth in the Declaration of David Rifkind,
8 concurrently filed in support hereof, under these terms, the Debtor would not be
9 able to obtain sufficient funds to repay GECC. (*Id.* at ¶ 28).

10 By failing to disclose any concrete financing plan, the Debtor practically
11 admits that it cannot borrow a large enough amount at a sufficiently low rate to
12 fund its Plan. Until the Debtor specifies *how* it will effectuate the proposed
13 refinancing, it will be unable to meet the disclosure requirements of Section 1125
14 of the Bankruptcy Code, and the Disclosure Statement may *not* be approved.

15 **F. The Debtor Fails To Adequately Disclose The Risk Factors**
16 **Relating To Its Ability To Refinance And/Or Sell The Property.**

17 Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code forces a complete disclosure and
18 quantification of all liabilities against the bankruptcy estate, so that a meaningful
19 plan can be negotiated and confirmed. *In Re Diberto*, 164 B.R. 1, 4 (Bankr. D.
20 N.H. 1993). At a minimum, a disclosure statement must “contain all material
21 information relating to the risks posed to creditors and equity interest holders under
22 the proposed plan of reorganization.” *In re Cardinal Congregate I*, 121 B.R. 760,
23 765 (Bankr. S.D. Ohio 1990); *see also In Re Bjolmes Realty Trust*, 134 B.R. 1000,
24 1001-1002 (Bankr. D. Mass. 1991).

25 **1. The Debtor Does Not Adequately Disclose The Tenant Risk.**

26 The Debtor characterizes its rental market risk as “whether the Property will
27 continue to produce the same rents and cash flow going forward.” (Disclosure
28 Statement, VI.I, p. 38). The Debtor states that if the Battelle Property is unable to

1 produce the same rents and cash flow, “there is a risk that the cash flow from
2 operations will be inadequate to fund the Plan.” (*Id.*)

3 The Disclosure Statement fails to disclose that the Facilities Leases provide
4 for rents significantly above-market and that there are few, if any, potential
5 replacement tenants for the Battelle Property. If Battelle leaves, which it may
6 under the lease agreements between 2017 and 2018 (see Disclosure Statement,
7 IV.C., p. 14), there is practically no possibility of re-tenanting the Battelle
8 Property. Moreover, any re-tenanting is likely to require significant tenant
9 improvements for which the Debtor does *not* have sufficient financial resources.
10 The Debtor also fails to disclose that the passage of time makes obtaining
11 financing less likely because the future revenue stream from, and with it the value
12 of the Debtor’s interest in, the Battelle Property decreases over time. (Disclosure
13 Statement, VI.H., p. 38; Rifkind Decl., ¶ 20).

14 **2. The Debtor Does Not Adequately Disclose The Market Risk.**

15 The Debtor implies, but does not adequately disclose, that current financing
16 for the Debtor’s interest in the Battelle Property that would render the Plan feasible
17 does not exist. Moreover, the Debtor fails to disclose that the passage of time
18 reduces its ability to obtain financing due to the Battelle Property’s decreasing
19 revenue stream. The Debtor seeks to shift all of the risk of the Plan’s infeasibility
20 onto GECC in the hope that the market improves. This is not a Plan, and is
21 inappropriate.

22 The Debtor references the risks related to the real estate and credit markets
23 in terms of “whether or not the values of real estate will stabilize and result in a
24 market where purchasers are again common and whether credit markets will
25 stabilize so that lending to these types of business ventures again becomes readily
26 available. If these do not occur, the balloon payments required by the Plan may
27 not be possible.” (Disclosure Statement, VI.H., p. 38).

28 Refinancing the Loan is the core of the Debtor’s Plan. The Debtor’s failure

1 to provide any support for its ability to obtain this financing constitutes materially
2 inadequate disclosure. The Debtor all but admits, but does not adequately disclose,
3 that current financing for its interest in the Battelle Property does not exist in an
4 amount large enough and at a rate sufficiently low enough to render its Plan
5 feasible. All the Plan accomplishes is to place all the risk on GECC while the
6 Debtor prays for markets to improve. Therefore, the Disclosure Statement does
7 not provide adequate information and may *not* be approved.

8 **3. The Debtor Is Likely To Face A Subsequent Liquidation.**

9 The Disclosure Statement provides that if replacement financing is
10 unattainable, the Debtor will have to sell its interest in the Battelle Property and a
11 liquidation will ensue. Section 1129(a)(11) of the Bankruptcy Code prohibits the
12 confirmation of a plan of reorganization that is “likely to be followed by the
13 liquidation, or the need for further financial reorganization, of the debtor or any
14 successor to the debtor under the plan, unless such liquidation or reorganization is
15 proposed in the plan.”

16 The Debtor fails to disclose that, for the reasons set forth above, it is highly
17 probable that the Debtor will be unable to obtain replacement financing in an
18 amount sufficient to repay GECC, that present market conditions will not support
19 the financing the Debtor requires to effectuate its Plan, and that this financing will
20 be even less obtainable three years from today. (*See* Rifkind Decl., ¶ 28). Thus,
21 the Debtor has failed to show that the Plan is not likely to be followed by a
22 liquidation. As such, the Plan cannot be confirmed under Section 1129(a).

23 **G. The Infeasibility Of The Plan And Anticipated Liquidation Make**
24 **It Unconfirmable.**

25 “If the disclosure statement describes a plan that is so ‘fatally flawed’ that
26 confirmation is ‘impossible,’ the Court should exercise its discretion to refuse to
27 consider the adequacy of its disclosures.” *In re Eastern Maine Electric*
28 *Cooperative, Inc.*, 125 B.R. 329, 333 (Bankr. D. Me. 1991) (quoting *In re Cardinal*

1 *Congregate I*, 121 B.R. at 764); *see also In re Monroe Well Service, Inc.*, 80 B.R.
2 324; *In re Pecht*, 57 B.R. 137 (Bankr. E.D. Va. 1986).

3 Where a plan's inadequacies are patent, there is no utility in proceeding with
4 the burden and expense of seeking confirmation. *In re Pecht*, 57 B.R. at 139.
5 Such an exercise in futility would needlessly increase administrative expenses –
6 thereby eroding the bankruptcy estate – for a confirmation process doomed to
7 failure. *See, e.g., In re Market Square Inn, Inc.*, 163 B.R. 64, 68 (Bankr. W.D. Pa.
8 1994); *In re Pecht*, 53 B.R. 768, 769-70 (Bankr. E.D. Va. 1985).

9 This Court should consider the issues of confirmability, even though this
10 case is only at the disclosure statement stage. Replacement financing for the
11 Allowed Claims is a critical component of the Plan. Although the Debtor
12 "believes" that it will be able to timely perform all obligations described in the
13 Plan, the Debtor fails to consider the significant risks a lender would face in
14 providing financing and, in turn, the likelihood that the Debtor will not be able to
15 obtain it. (Disclosure Statement, VI.H., p. 38). The Debtor also fails to
16 acknowledge that it cannot legally or financially cram down GECC and, therefore,
17 its Plan (even if it were feasible) is incapable of confirmation. Until the Debtor
18 states with specificity *how* it will effectuate the proposed refinancing, can provide
19 facts demonstrating the availability of this financing, can show that it can afford to
20 cram down GECC (which it cannot) and can demonstrate that a cram down is
21 legally appropriate (which it is not), the Plan cannot be considered feasible, or
22 confirmable, as an eventual liquidation is very likely.

23 **H. Disapproval Of The Disclosure Statement Will Preserve The**
24 **Estate.**

25 As a result of the defects described in the foregoing sections, the Plan is
26 incapable of being confirmed as currently drafted. Consequently, it is in the best
27 interests of everyone involved in the case to avoid the needless diversion of time
28 and resources that would be wasted in the futile effort of disseminating the

1 Disclosure Statement, tabulating ballots, preparing objections to confirmation and
2 undergoing a contentious and doomed confirmation process. Accordingly, in order
3 to conserve the limited resources of the estate and encourage the good faith
4 resolution of the case, the Court should refuse to approve the Disclosure Statement
5 on grounds of Plan unconfirmability, as well as disclosure defects.²

6 **IV. CONCLUSION**

7 Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, GECC respectfully requests that
8 the Court (i) *not* approve the Disclosure Statement, (ii) order that the Plan cannot
9 be confirmed as drafted, and (iii) and grant such other relief as the Court deems
10 just and proper.

11 DATED: March 2, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

12 By:

STOEL RIVES LLP

13
14 By: /s/ Erin L. Eliasen
15 David B. Levant, WSBA No. 20528
16 Erin L. Eliasen, WSBA No. 37606

and

17 Primary Counsel:
18 (Please Contact
19 Primary Counsel)

20 LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
21 Peter M. Gilhuly (*admitted pro hac vice*)
22 Ted A. Dillman (*admitted pro hac vice*)
23 355 South Grand Avenue
24 Los Angeles, California 90071-1560
25 Telephone: (213) 485-1234
26 Facsimile: (213) 891-8763
27 peter.gilhuly@lw.com
28 ted.dillman@lw.com

29
30 Attorneys for General Electric Capital
31 Corporation

32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
5510
5511
5512
5513
5514
5515
5516
5517
5518
5519
5520
5521
5522
5523
5524
5525
5526
5527
5528
5529
5530
5531
5532
5533
5534
5535
5536
5537
5538
5539
55310
55311
55312
55313
55314
55315
55316
55317
55318
55319
55320
55321
55322
55323
55324
55325
55326
55327
55328
55329
55330
55331
55332
55333
55334
55335
55336
55337
55338
55339
55340
55341
55342
55343
55344
55345
55346
55347
55348
55349
55350
55351
55352
55353
55354
55355
55356
55357
55358
55359
55360
55361
55362
55363
55364
55365
55366
55367
55368
55369
55370
55371
55372
55373
55374
55375
55376
55377
55378
55379
55380
55381
55382
55383
55384
55385
55386
55387
55388
55389
55390
55391
55392
55393
55394
55395
55396
55397
55398
55399
553100
553101
553102
553103
553104
553105
553106
553107
553108
553109
553110
553111
553112
553113
553114
553115
553116
553117
553118
553119
553120
553121
553122
553123
553124
553125
553126
553127
553128
553129
553130
553131
553132
553133
553134
553135
553136
553137
553138
553139
553140
553141
553142
553143
553144
553145
553146
553147
553148
553149
553150
553151
553152
553153
553154
553155
553156
553157
553158
553159
553160
553161
553162
553163
553164
553165
553166
553167
553168
553169
553170
553171
553172
553173
553174
553175
553176
553177
553178
553179
553180
553181
553182
553183
553184
553185
553186
553187
553188
553189
553190
553191
553192
553193
553194
553195
553196
553197
553198
553199
553200
553201
553202
553203
553204
553205
553206
553207
553208
553209
553210
553211
553212
553213
553214
553215
553216
553217
553218
553219
553220
553221
553222
553223
553224
553225
553226
553227
553228
553229
553230
553231
553232
553233
553234
553235
553236
553237
553238
553239
553240
553241
553242
553243
553244
553245
553246
553247
553248
553249
553250
553251
553252
553253
553254
553255
553256
553257
553258
553259
553260
553261
553262
553263
553264
553265
553266
553267
553268
553269
553270
553271
553272
553273
553274
553275
553276
553277
553278
553279
553280
553281
553282
553283
553284
553285
553286
553287
553288
553289
553290
553291
553292
553293
553294
553295
553296
553297
553298
553299
553300
553301
553302
553303
553304
553305
553306
553307
553308
553309
553310
553311
553312
553313
553314
553315
553316
553317
553318
553319
553320
553321
553322
553323
553324
553325
553326
553327
553328
553329
553330
553331
553332
553333
553334
553335
553336
553337
553338
553339
553340
553341
553342
553343
553344
553345
553346
553347
553348
553349
553350
553351
553352
553353
553354
553355
553356
553357
553358
553359
553360
553361
553362
553363
553364
553365
553366
553367
553368
553369
553370
553371
553372
553373
553374
553375
553376
553377
553378
553379
553380
553381
553382
553383
553384
553385
553386
553387
553388
553389
553390
553391
553392
553393
553394
553395
553396
553397
553398
553399
553400
553401
553402
553403
553404
553405
553406
553407
553408
553409
553410
553411
553412
553413
553414
553415
553416
553417
553418
553419
553420
553421
553422
553423
553424
553425
553426
553427
553428
553429
553430
553431
553432
553433
553434
553435
553436
553437
553438
553439
553440
553441
553442
553443
553444
553445
553446
553447
553448
553449
553450
553451
553452
553453
553454
553455
553456
553457
553458
553459
553460
553461
553462
553463
553464
553465
553466
553467
553468
553469
553470
553471
553472
553473
553474
553475
553476
553477
553478
553479
553480
553481
553482
553483
553484
553485
553486
553487
553488
553489
553490
553491
553492
553493
553494
553495
553496
553497
553498
553499
553500
553501
553502
553503
553504
553505
553506
553507
553508
553509
553510
553511
553512
553513
553514
553515
553516
553517
553518
553519
553520
553521
553522
553523
553524
553525
553526
553527
553528
553529
553530
553531
553532
553533
553534
553535
553536
553537
553538
553539
553540
553541
553542
553543
553544
553545
553546
553547
553548
553549
553550
553551
553552
553553
553554
553555
553556
553557
553558
553559
553560
553561
553562
553563
553564
553565
553566
553567
553568
553569
553570
553571
553572
553573
553574
553575
553576
553577
553578
553579
553580
553581
553582
553583
553584
553585
553586
553587
553588
553589
553590
553591
553592
553593
553594
553595
553596
553597
553598
553599
553600
553601
553602
553603
553604
553605
553606
553607
553608
553609
553610
553611
553612
553613
553614
553615
553616
553617
553618
553619
553620
553621
553622
553623
553624
553625
553626
553627
553628
553629
553630
553631
553632
553633
553634
553635
553636
553637
553638
553639
553640
553641
553642
553643
553644
553645
553646
553647
553648
553649
553650
553651
553652
553653
553654
553655
553656
553657
553658
553659
553660
553661
553662
553663
553664
553665
553666
553667
553668
553669
553670
553671
553672
553673
553674
553675
553676
553677
553678
553679
553680
553681
553682
553683
553684
553685
553686
553687
553688
553689
553690
553691
553692
553693
553694
553695
553696
553697
553698
553699
553700
553701
553702
553703
553704
553705
553706
553707
553708
553709
553710
553711
553712
553713
553714
553715
553716
553717
553718
553719
553720
553721
553722
553723
553724
553725
553726
553727
553728
553729
553730
553731
553732
553733
553734
553735
553736
553737
553738
553739
5537340
5537341
5537342
5537343
5537344
5537345
5537346
5537347
5537348
5537349
5537350
5537351
5537352
5537353
5537354
5537355
5537356
5537357
5537358
5537359
55373510
55373511
55373512
55373513
55373514
55373515
55373516
55373517
55373518
55373519
55373520
55373521
55373522
55373523
55373524
55373525
55373526
55373527
55373528
55373529
55373530
55373531
55373532
55373533
55373534
55373535
55373536
55373537
55373538
55373539
55373540
55373541
55373542
55373543
55373544
55373545
55373546
55373547
55373548
55373549
55373550
55373551
55373552
55373553
55373554
55373555
55373556
55373557
55373558
55373559
55373560
55373561
55373562
55373563
55373564
55373565
55373566
55373567
55373568
55373569
55373570
55373571
55373572
55373573
55373574
55373575
55373576
55373577
55373578
55373579
55373580
55373581
55373582
55373583
55373584
55373585
55373586
55373587
55373588
55373589
55373590
55373591
55373592
55373593
55373594
55373595
55373596
55373597
55373598
55373599
553735100
553735101
553735102
553735103
553735104
553735105
553735106
553735107
553735108
553735109
553735110
553735111
553735112
553735113
553735114
553735115
553735116
553735117
553735118
553735119
553735120
553735121
553735122
553735123
553735124
553735125
553735126
553735127
553735128
553735129
553735130
553735131
553735132
553735133
553735134
553735135
553735136
553735137
553735138
553735139
553735140
553735141
553735142
553735143
553735144
553735145
553735146
553735147
553735148
553735149
553735150
553735151
553735152
553735153
553735154
553735155
553735156
553735157
553735158
553735159
553735160
553735161
553735162
553735163
553735164
553735165
553735166
553735167
553735168
553735169
553735170
553735171
553735172
553735173
553735174
553735175
553735176
553735177
553735178
553735179
553735180
553735181
553735182
553735183
553735184
55373